

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation, and does not serve the public interest.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. This, in my opinion, would mean that they provide ample time to all the major candidates, most of it FREE of charge, and should not play favorites regardless of the facts.

Where is Sinclair's journalistic responsibility? I would understand if they aired a COMMERCIAL that was fully paid by an interest group, but to provide free time to a totally discredited group is an outrage!

Would it be "fair and balanced" action if they gave the same time to a "sage" who has heard from the Tooth Fairy via a message brought by a Unicorn, that president Bush is actually an alien from outer space, sworn to the destruction of all earthlinks??!!!!....

But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

I hope that the FCC does something about this concern of mine, and in my estimate, of a great number of my fellow citizens.

Thank you.